

POPTAC Methodology Subcommittee Meeting  
January 27, 2006

(Attachment A)

The meeting was called to order by David Lillie at 9:35a.m.

Lind Strock asked for nominations to serve as chair of this committee for 2006. David Lillie volunteered to serve. The members unanimously approved.

Samuel Colon reported on the July 1, 2005 estimates. He stated that new data were generated for the Composite Method. The over counted military was fixed in Cochise, Maricopa, Yuma, and Pima counties.

He also developed a “hybrid HUM” for counties 2001-2004. The results, however, showed that population did not change very much. Samuel also said that 37 jurisdictions are using building permit data. The issue relates to building permits vs. housing completions and lag times and units never built.

1990 to 2000 population growth was calculated (censuses) and compared to the growth of building permits issued, incorporating lag times. Samuel reported that in 50% of the jurisdictions, no differences were found.

A discussion ensued between several members. Anubhav Bagley, MAG, initiated the discussion by asking questions relating to these issues. After a short discussion, he asked additional questions about lag time and DMV data.

Tom Rex, Harry Wolfe, Kristen Zimmerman, and Linda Strock also made comments. Tom said that there are strange breaks in the data and some numbers had to be made up. The problem is with the data and not the methods. Harry, for instance, has concerns with some assumptions made (*viz.*, change in the housing stock in relationship to units not build). Tom agreed and said that we all have that concern. Krisen voiced her concern about applying a 2% never build factor and that a comparison needs to be made in Pima County as well. Linda said they can look at that issue in Pima County.

Susan Kanzler addressed two issues relating to the draft population projection series (2006-2055): each county was adjusted to vital statistics which resulted in about 12 runs for each county; considered growth constraints to reduce excessive amounts of growth in the counties. She said that Census Bureau projections were used and that population growth was shared by counties to reduce excessive long-term growth.

Results showed that some had zero “never built” which others had 2%. The conclusions would be posted on the web today.

Susan asked for questions or comments. The discussion that followed mainly involved questions and comments from Tom Rex, Mila Hill, Pete Kozy, Linda Strock, Jami Garrison, Jack Tomasik, Kristen Zimmerman, Anubhav Bagley, and Susan Kanzler. The following statements/conclusions were made:

1. There is a myth about the elderly population in Arizona (according to a newspaper article, Arizona ranks 5<sup>th</sup> in population under 8 years (2004))
2. The DES projection model is a demographic model (no link to jobs)
3. Migration is the largest component of population change
4. Job stimulation produces in- and out-migration
5. Economic conditions if a missing component
6. DES could prepare “unofficial” projections each year
7. DES could consider economic links and make adjustments to the demographic model
8. DES should produce high, medium, and low projections (constrained by the EO)
9. DES can produce one set only of a likely scenario
10. Susan K. commented on the Uof A model
11. Without long-term constraints, you could have extremely large numbers
12. In-migration of Hispanics is a significant component of population growth for some counties
13. Need to address domestic and foreign migration (how do you do it?)
14. Unusual trends were noted in some of the projections (e.g., 2029-2030) [Census Bureau projections were used; AZ projections were adjusted to U.S. as a whole by age by sex]
15. If looking for an economic model for projections, also do it for estimates
16. A third method could be a method economically driven
17. If estimates are too high, then, projections will be too high
18. More concerned with short-term projections
19. Some counties are showing “an awful lot of population growth”
20. Globally, mega cities are projected (growth trend)
21. Census Bureau is assuming 880,000 in-migrants annually for its projections, and the Baby boomer generation is aging
22. We need multi projections scenarios (could do in interim years)
23. Pinal County growth is driven by expansion of the Phoenix MSA (and other counties)
24. In 10-20 years this will be true for the Tucson MSA
25. This warrants a different look at the method for Pinal County
26. How do you apply population constraints due to lack of water?
27. Growth trends were looked at based on share of growth which sets long-term growth for each county (makes it uniform for each county, but Pinal County in the shorter run is based on a higher growth)
28. Projections do not recognize cyclical trends

Kristen asked Susan Kanzler to address the change in vital statistics.

Note that this topic took most of the remaining time that almost no time was left to discuss the handout (estimate and projection topics to discuss for the 2006 cycle).

Pete Kozy asked for proposal for projects today, or Monday at the latest. By June 1, 2006, DES will begin the activities that were decided for this year (i.e., the first half of the year involves new research or projects).

Jack Tamasik stated that for the Composite Method, data are commingled with Maricopa and Pinal counties. He will provide DES with a written comment.

Anubhav asked for more frequent meetings of the Methodology Subcommittee.

David Lillie adjourned the meeting at 10:42a.m.

\*The sign-in sheet shows 18 in attendance. Nobody called in.